

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

In re K.M., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

K.M.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A138052

(Contra Costa County Super. Ct. No.
J0901104)

MEMORANDUM OPINION¹

Defendant K.M. appeals from a restitution order requiring him to pay \$1,150 to the owner of a car defendant was found to have stolen. His appointed counsel on appeal has filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*), in which counsel raises no issue for appeal and asks this court for an independent review of the record. (See also *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106 (*Kelly*).) Counsel has averred defendant has been informed of his right to file a supplemental brief. We have received no such brief.

We summarize only the facts and procedural background relevant to review of the restitution order. On September 24, 2012, the juvenile court sustained allegations that

¹ This matter is properly disposed of by memorandum opinion pursuant to California Standards of Judicial Administration, section 8.1, subdivisions (1) and (3).

defendant stole a car (a felony, Veh. Code, § 10851, subd. (a)), possessed a firearm (a felony, Pen. Code, § 29610), evaded a police officer (a felony, Veh. Code, § 2800.2, subd. (a)), and resisted arrest (a misdemeanor, Pen. Code, § 148, subd. (a)(1)). A photograph introduced at the jurisdiction hearing showed damage to the front driver's side of the car, an Acura. The report prepared for the disposition hearing stated the owner of the car had advised the police officers of damage to the sound system and that it cost him \$370 to retrieve the car from a tow yard. The owner subsequently completed a victim claim form and description of the loss, identifying the following: two stereo amplifiers (\$300), two speakers (\$200), speaker damage (\$80), all car locks (\$100), driver's side door (\$100), and road service (\$370), totaling \$1,150. He also submitted a receipt for the road service.

At the restitution hearing, defense counsel did not take issue with the claim for road service, but questioned the other amounts. He did not disagree they could be reasonable amounts, but claimed there should be more documentation "of a reliable sort." The court found the amount claimed "very reasonable" given the damage to the car.

Having reviewed the entire record in accordance with *Wende* and *Kelly*, we agree no arguable issue exists on appeal. Defendant was ably represented by counsel during the restitution proceedings, and the court's restitution order is amply supported by the record.

We therefore affirm the juvenile court's restitution order.

Banke, J.

We concur:

Margulies, Acting P. J.

Dondero, J.